

REMARKS

An Office Action was mailed on October 3, 2003 and declared final. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12 and 13 are pending.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12 and 13 are objected to because of use of the term "word." Responsive thereto, Applicant has rephrased such term into -- message components --. The specification clearly sets forth that complete messages are displayed on a display screen in a gradual fashion, i.e., different portions of the message are sequentially displayed until the entire message is achieved. The Examiner suggests that the specification sets forth only a sequential display of *messages* and *phrases*. However, Applicant respectfully submits that "words" are also clearly contemplated (see FIG. 2A). The term "phrase" is commonly understood to mean two or more words, although one-word phrases are also generally accepted and understood, while the term "message" is commonly understood to mean a plurality of words. To overcome any confusion between what parts of a message are being sequentially displayed, and to avoid future questions regarding the limitations of the term "phrase" or "message," Applicant has amended the claims to define both a "message" and its "message components," the "message components" understood to encompass words or phrases that form the "message." This is clearly supported in the specification and the drawings. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the claims.

Claims 1-2 are rejected again under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baals (U.S. Patent 5,392,337), while claims 4-5, 7-10 and 11-13 are rejected again under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baals in view of Armstrong (U.S. Patent 5,999,084). Such rejections are *almost identical* to the rejections from the Office Action of March 25, 2003. Responsive thereto, Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the present invention over the cited art. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As clearly illustrated in amended Figs. 2A, 2B, and 2C of the present application, a word or words, defined in the claims as -- message components -- are sequentially added to the end of the message already displayed on a screen until the complete message is displayed on the screen. The sequential rate at which the message components are added can be varied according to the

magnitude of the output value that is obtained from the pressure sensing means that can generate variable output. The amendments to claim 1 are representative of this concept:

1. *(currently amended) A recording medium on which are recorded computer-readable and executable software programs that perform processing by taking as commands an output from a controller which has a variable output pressure sensing means, wherein*

said software programs include processing programs that display messages on a screen of a computer in accordance with the output of said controller,

wherein each message comprises a pre-defined sentence having a plurality of words components, each word component of said plurality being sequentially displayed on said screen in a pre-defined order, and

wherein a magnitude of an output value obtained from said variable output pressure sensing means determines the sequential rate at which words components of said plurality are sequentially displayed on said screen.

The Examiner is respectfully directed in particular to the amendments to the last element of claim 1, relating to the correspondence between the variable output pressure sensing means and the sequential rate at which components are displayed on the screen. It is the sequential rate, or the rate at which additional message components are displayed, that clearly distinguishes the present invention from the prior art.

Contrary to such a teaching and disclosure of the present invention, in Baals the duration time of the display screens for messages can be changed to optimize the duration time in accordance with the complexity content of the information. The Examiner is respectfully directed to the example provided by Baals at column 4, lines 38-59:

...Within this framework, messages are categorized and the three speeds, Slow, Med and Fast, for each group of messages are selected. Empirical results show that optimum times for the simple group messages employed in the display 210 are Fast=2 seconds, Med=4 seconds, and Slow=8 seconds. And the optimum times for the complex group messages are Fast=3 seconds, Med=5 seconds, and Slow=9 seconds. Thus, in accordance with the invention, the display times for both the simple and complex group

messages are advantageously determined for the user without the need for direct knowledge by the user of the complexity of the text of the information being presented in the display screens. As a result, the user, after making an initial selection display speed, is generally able to use the telephone terminal easier and more fully very quickly. As the user becomes more familiar with the operation of the terminal, he or she also is able to adjust the display in accordance with his or her needs. In addition, a user may elect to exit the timed information screen display process by pressing any softkey button.

The Examiner is particularly directed to lines 41-46 emphasized above in ***boldface*** type. It is clear that Baals is not directed to the determination of a sequential rate of displaying message components or displaying additional message components, but is instead directed to the determination of a display duration. For example, note the "8 second" value for slow messages, which clearly relates to the duration of the message on the screen and not the time delay between each sequentially displayed message component, since one would clearly not wait 8 seconds for the display of each message component, particularly if the message is defined by three or more components each having 1-5 words for example. This is also clearly evident in Baals at column 3, lines 45-48 and reference number 210, "The length of time for the presentation of the display screens on the display 210 is a variable which is controllable by a user of the telephone terminal, in accordance with the invention." (emphasis added), and in the Baals discussion in column 3, lines 58, referring to "presentation speeds." Besides, the "slow," "medium" and "fast" buttons relating to presentation durations are user selectable based on a pressing member 226-229 that do not have or generate a variable output responsive to a variable input. The softkeys 226-229 merely define the presentation speeds (column 2, lines 62 - column 3, line 19). Baals simply fails to disclose or suggest any word, phrase or message component that is sequentially added to the previous message component at a sequential rate and that has already been displayed on a screen to form a message.

Thus, the present invention and the invention in Baals clearly differ in that in the present invention the additional or sequential rate of a word, phrase, or message component that is displayed on a screen can be varied according to the variable output of the variable pressure-

sensing means, while in Baals only the duration time of the display screens for messages can be changed according to the activation of a softkey.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Baals.

With respect to claims 4-5, 7-10 and 11-13, Armstrong '084 clearly fails to provide any teaching or motivation whatsoever to one skilled in the art to modify the construction of Baals to arrive at the claimed invention. As the CAFC stresses for a § 103 rejection to stand, the Examiner is required to show **with evidence** the motivation, suggestion or teaching of the desirability of making the specific combination at issue. That evidence is required to counter the powerful attraction of a hindsight-based obviousness analysis. See, for example, *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1343, 61 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1430, 1433 (Fed. Cir. 2002) ("Our case law makes clear that the best defense against the subtle but powerful attraction of a hindsight-based obviousness analysis is rigorous application of the requirement for a showing of the teaching or motivation to combine prior art references"). It is respectfully submitted that this involves more than a mere bald assertion that it would be obvious to combine the cited references. With respect, the Examiner has failed to indicate why one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of Baals and Armstrong. In fact, the Examiner fails to reference any aspect or passage from Armstrong in his §103(a) rejection. *In re Lee* requires that the record must state with particularity all the evidence and rationale on which the PTO relies for a rejection and sets out that it is necessary to explain the reasons one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the references and to combine them to render the claimed invention obvious. Under *Lee*, the PTO must state in writing **the evidence** on which it bases its rejection. With respect to the §103(a) rejection based in part on Armstrong, the present office action woefully falls short of this requirement. Applicant respectfully submits that Baals lacks a fundamental teaching of the claimed invention as set forth above with respect to claims 1-2, which teaching cannot be cured by any disclosure in Armstrong '084. Armstrong '084 does not disclose or suggest any control of the sequential rate of the sequential display of message components in accordance with the magnitude of the output value of the pressure sensing means.

For all the foregoing reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.


09/757,807
11174849 01

- 8 -

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10 and 12-13, consisting of independent claims 1, 4 and 9 and the claims dependent therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Passage of this case to allowance is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Harris A. Wolin
Reg. No. 39,432

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
PHONE: (212) 940-8708
FAX: (212) 894-5708
DOCKET NO.: SCEI 17.998 (100809-16216)